

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,756	10/30/2003	Yoshiaki Kohama	107322.02	6180
25944	25944 7590 02/08/2005		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			VANORE, DAVID A	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2881	
			DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	HA HA
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/695,756	KOHAMA, YOSHIAKI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	David A Vanore	2881
Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	iui trie correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sply within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) □ Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) □ This action is FINAL.	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal mat	• •
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the file.	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ c ne drawing(s) be held in abeya ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). i(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No. <u>09/664,136</u> . I received in this National Stage
AM-2-h		
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/03.	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/695,756

Art Unit: 2881

## Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 through 10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,587 (KOHAMA et al.). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons:

Pending claim 1 conflicts with patented claim 1 where patented claim 1 recites a TDI sensor in place of the sensor of claim 1. Since a TDI sensor is a still a sensor, patented claim 1 does conflict with pending claim 1.

Pending claim recites that a primary optical system shapes a beam into an elliptical form. Patented claims 1 and 2 recite the primary optical system and the shaping of the beam into rectangular form. The specification further states at Col. 10 Lines 51-57 that beam shaping may produce a rectangular or elliptical conformation.

Therefore, it is apparent from the specification that in the practice of the invention that

Art Unit: 2881

shaping the beam into a rectangular or elliptical conformation are substantially equivalent, and therefore, patented claim 2 conflicts with pending claim 2.

Pending claim 3 recites that which is noted above in regards to patented claim 2.

Pending claim 4 depends on pending claim 1 and is identical to patented claim 3.

Therefore, pending claim 4 is in conflict with patented claims 1 and 3.

Pending claim 5 is in conflict with patented claim 4.

Pending claim 6 is in conflict with patented claim 5.

Pending claim 7 is in conflict with patented claim 6.

Pending claim 8 is in conflict with patented claim 4. Though claim 4 does not recite the laser interferometer of pending claim 8, the position compensation signal recited in claim 4 is derived from positional information read by a laser interferometer as recited in the specification (Col. 7 Line 60 to Col. 8 Line 7), therefore, the laser interferometer recited in pending claim 8 is required for the practice of the invention in patented claim 4.

Pending claim 9 is in conflict with patented claim 4 because patented claim 4 contains all the limitations of pending claim 8 and further comprises a secondary optical system.

Pending claim 10 is in conflict with patented claim 1.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A Vanore whose telephone number is (571) 272-2483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2881

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dav

SOM R. LEE
STATEMENT EXAMINER
STATEMENT ON COLUMN 2800